

Remarks

Reconsideration of the Office Action of October 10, 2006 is respectfully requested.

I. Drawings

The Examiner objected to Fig. 1, for failing to denote the reference numeral “16”.

Applicant notes that the apparatus described in the specification called the pulling device and the apparatus in the specification called the puller are the same and were mistakenly given two reference numbers, namely, “16” and “34”. Accordingly, Applicant submits an amendment to the specification changing the number 16 to 34. As such, Applicant believes that the Examiner’s objection is overcome.

The Examiner further objected to Fig. 7, for failing to denote “141”, Fig. 9 for failing to denote “68” and Figure 11 for failing to denote “300”. The Applicant submits three replacement drawings to correct these deficiencies. As such, Applicant believes that the Examiner’s objection is overcome.

II. Specification

The use of the trademark “Aralite MY 721” on page 43 of the specification has been objected to by the Examiner. Applicant submits an amendment to the specification in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. “Aralite MY 721” has been changed to “ARALDITE MY 721”. Applicant also corrected a typo and changed the name Aralite to the proper name, Araldite. In addition, the language “an epoxy resin called” has been added to introduce “Araldite MY 721” describing the generic terminology. Support for this language may be found in the chart on page 46 of the specification where the heading reads “epoxy matrix system”. Accordingly, no new matter has been added with this amendment and Applicant believes that the Examiner’s objection has been satisfied.

III. Claim Rejections 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 104, 106, 114-115, 124-125, 127, 135, 137, 155, 157, 167, and 166-176 under 35 USC §112.

Claims 130, 131, 132, 134-147, 149-153, 155-157, 165-176 have been cancelled.

Claim 103 has been amended to more particularly claim the physical properties of the fibers of the composite core, to clarify that the fibers of the inner core are different from the fibers of the outer core and further to define the orientation of the fibers within the composite core. In addition, the language “reinforced fiber type” in the claims has been amended to “reinforcing fibers” in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. Claims 104-113 have been amended in accordance with the amendments in the amended claim 103. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the Examiner’s rejection has been satisfied.

Support for the claim amendments related to claim 103 may be found in the specification. Particularly, page 15, line 7, “[a]n advanced composite is a composite having continuous fibers having a greater than 50% volume fraction and mechanical properties exceeding the mechanical properties of glassfibers. Further, it is preferable to have an outer layer low modulus composite having mechanical properties in the range of glass fiber.” In addition, on the same page, “A low modulus fiber has mechanical characteristics in the range of glass fiber.” And see, “Fibers forming an advanced composite are selected preferably having a tensile strength in the range of about 350 to about 750 ksi; a modulus of elasticity preferably in the range of about 22 to about 37 Msi...” in addition to, “Fibers forming the outer low modulus layer surrounding the advanced composite preferably have a tensile strength in the range within about 180 to 220 ksi...”.

Claim 114 has been amended to more particularly claim the physical properties of the fibers of the composite core. In addition, claims 115-123 have been amended in accordance with the amendments with respect to claim 114. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification as discussed for claim 103.

Claim 124 has been amended to more particularly claim the physical properties of the fibers, to clarify that the fibers of the inner core are different from the fibers of the outer core and further to define the orientation of the fibers within the composite core. In addition, the language, “reinforced fiber type” in the claims has been amended to “reinforcing fibers” in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. Claims 125-127 have been amended consistent with amended claim 124. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification as discussed for claim 103.

Claim 148 has been amended to more particularly claim the physical properties of the fibers, to clarify that the fibers of the inner core are different from the fibers of the outer core and further to define the orientation of the fibers within the composite core. In addition, the language, “reinforced fiber type” in the claims has been amended to “reinforcing fibers” in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. Claims 161-163 have been amended consistent with amended claim 148. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification as discussed for claim 103.

Claim 164 has been amended to more particularly claim the physical properties of the fibers, to clarify that the fibers of the inner core are different from the fibers of the outer core and further to define the orientation of the fibers within the composite core. In addition, the language, “reinforced fiber type” in the claims has been amended to “reinforcing fibers” in accordance with

the Examiner's suggestion. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification as discussed for claim 103.

IV. Double Patenting

Claims 103, 104, 108, 110, 111, 112, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 155, 159, 161, 162, and 163 have been rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection over co-pending application 10/691,447. Applicant herewith files a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c).

Claims 103, 106, 113, 114, 115, 123, 124, 125, 127, 133, 148, 149, 153 have been rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection over co-pending application 10/971,629. Applicant herewith files a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c).

Claim 165 has been cancelled, thereby obviating the statutory double patenting rejection.

Applicant believes that all of the claims now pending in this patent application are allowable and that the issues raised by the examiner have been addressed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and remove her rejections and to grant an early allowance. If any questions or issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

The McIntosh Group

/Kelly de la Torre/

Kelly de la Torre, Esq.
Reg. No. 53,677
12635 E. Montview Blvd., Suite 370
Aurora, CO 80010
(720) 859-3543

Date: December 29, 2006